

SMSgt (Ret.) Rob Rosenberger

Twitter @rsnbrgr

This PDF / ZIP / folder / _____ contains first-generation scans and/or photographs of original UNCLASSIFIED historical papers in the public domain stored in the Air Force Historical Research Agency at Maxwell AFB, Alabama. SMSgt (Ret.) Rob Rosenberger accessioned the enclosed papers into his personal collection and he donates this effort to the PUBLIC DOMAIN.

EO 12958: 15 APR 1980 My accession: 25 JUN 24 Initials: RD

Title: HISTORY OF THE 57TH AIR DIVISION

Date(s): AUG-SEP 1959

Call: K-DIV-57-HI Volume: N/A

IRIS: 46574

☐ ALL ☒ Selected Papers ☐ Except

☐ copyrighted news stories; congressional bios; tabbed & oversized pages

FRONT MATTER

NARRATIVE

EXHIBIT 9, GO-3

EXHIBIT 10, BIO FOR BGEN JOHN C. MEYER

~~SECRET~~ DECLASSIFIED 314081

15 APR 1980

HISTORY

of the

57TH AIR DIVISION

P.R.C

(Unclassified Title)

Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts

August - September 1959

Component Parts

814th Combat Support Group

4050th Air Refueling Wing

CLASSIFIED 99th Bombardment Wing
SUBJECT TO GENERAL DECLASSIFICATION
SCHEDULE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 11652
AUTOMATICALLY DOWNGRADED AT TWO YEAR
INTERVALS DECLASSIFIED ON DECEMBER
31, 1967

This document was prepared by TSgt Victor L. Miramontes, Historian, under the supervision of Lt Colonel Donald S. Davis, Information Officer.

David A. Peterson, Col USAF

for JOHN C. MEYER
Brigadier General, USAF
Commander

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED

15 APR 1980

0465711

4-4871-7

Eighth Air Force

S-T-R-A-T-E-G-I-C A-I-R C-O-M-M-A-N-D

57-59- 6770

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT AND SHORTAGES	1
Spot Promotions	1
Retention	3
Crew Member's Questions	5
Navigator Shortage	5
Airmen MIRS	6
Personnel Strength	7
Assumption of Command	8

CHAPTER II

OPERATIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS	9
Award Programs	9
Aircraft Allocation	11
Simulator Training	12
Base Instrument School Instructors	13
Weapons Performance	17

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTION AND MODIFICATION OF BASE FACILITIES	18
Crew Readiness Building	18
Alert Force Trailers	21
Security Barriers	21
Capehart Housing	22

SECRET

SECRET

CHAPTER I

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT AND SHORTAGES

Spot Promotions

At the request of the Eighth Air Force Commander, the Division Commander, Brigadier General John C. Meyer, presented the requested ideas for the justification for the retention of spot promotions which he termed as the most demanding requirement in the retention of the highest caliber personnel possible. General Meyer further stated that it was a constant battle at Division level to compete with industry and business; industry being capable of immediately rewarding and recognizing talent. The inability of the Government agencies to follow this pattern indicated to the combat crews the possible disinterest this country really had in the important role of SAC.¹ (U)

An important fact was brought to the attention of the Eighth Air Force Commander which was that the consequent loss of desirable crew personnel was actually diluting to some degree the Division's capability. The Division continued to advise crews that a crew position was a career in itself and that the rank of Colonel was appropriate for the aircraft commander. The results of the action of having the spot promotion program defeated would be that many crew members with fifteen years plus flying would be desirous of transferring to staff jobs or resign from the service in order to progress. An already critical career field, that of navigator,² would become more unattractive. (U)

-
1. Msg, 57AD to 8AF, 57C, "Retention of Spot Promotions", 20 September 1959, Exhibit 1.
 2. Ibid.

In summary, it was emphasized that the incentive and competition created by the spot promotions system had maintained a high level of professional proficiency throughout the SAC force. Further, the spot promotion gave added impetus to the "elite corps" concept that had been instilled into the crews at the onset of the alert system. A third point was that the loss of spot promotions would seriously jeopardize the morale of the command and offset the many years of effort on the part of SAC to build the greatest deterrent force in history.³ (U)

In addition, there was no other incentive or recognition for SAC combat crew members that was commensurate with the increasing rewards and tremendous responsibility of their duty assignment. The underlying problem appeared to be the nationwide concept of premature missile capability and aircraft obsolescence. The longer range solution, then, to the spot promotion problem rested upon an information program directed at correcting this misconception. Finally, it was felt that even were this optimistic anticipation of an operational missile force to come true, the bomber fleet must be relied upon for national deterrence during the forthcoming year. In the final analysis, the most productive short range approach might be to dissuade action against spot promotions.⁴ (U)

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

Retention

The practice of giving letters of commendation and appreciation to airmen not eligible to reenlist was discouraged by Eighth Air Force. This practice could cause criticism to that headquarters and the Department of the Air Force in the quality retention efforts. This applied particularly to those cases where the airman's request for waiver to reenlist had been disapproved. A case in point had been brought to the attention of Eighth Air Force wherein letters of commendation were involved. An airman who had been denied reenlistment for failure to meet Air Force standards had had letters of commendation prepared by his supervisors prior to separation and had used them as a basis for a letter to a Member of Congress which protested⁵ Air Force action which precluded his reenlistment. (U)

It was pointed out, however, that there were no objections to furnish such letters to airmen for the purpose of assisting these airmen in obtaining civilian employment. It was stipulated, also, that such letters must make clear their aim and state that the individual did not meet the required standards for reenlistment.⁶ (U)

On the other side of the retention picture was the problem of prompt disposition of airmen who had been determined as unsuitable for service. These airmen had become a source of trouble and grave

5. Msg, 8AF to 57AD, DPM2B 19079, "Letters of Commendation and Appreciation for Individuals Denied Reenlistment", 31 August 1959, File: DPR.

6. Ibid.

concern to the Division. The Director of Personnel was instructed⁷ to establish a procedure to dispose of these cases in one day. (U)

There were certain conditions that had to be met in order to meet this requirement. (1) The case must be completely documented to include physical examination and the indorsement by the evaluation officer and delivered to Personnel not later than 0830 hours. (2) Personnel was to prepare and indorse for and submit the case to the discharge authority for signature and alert their Separations Center. (3) The Director of Administrative Services will promptly issue necessary separation orders. (4) The Comptroller will assure⁸ that final payment would be made. (U)

To assure that no undue delay would occur, it was desired that these cases be handcarried by an NCO of the squadron to which respondent was assigned. Colonel O. F. Lassiter, the interim Division Commander, felt confident that, if a completed case properly documented was delivered to the Director of Personnel not later than 0830 hours of any day, the Division should experience no difficulty in discharging the individual the same day. Colonel Lassiter earnestly solicited the **closest** cooperation of the Division units in this matter because of the grave concern the problem had caused him.⁹ (U)

7. Ltr, 57AD to 99BW, et al, C, "Expeditious Disposition of AFR 39-16 Cases (Short)", 26 August 1959, File: 57D0.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

Crew Member's Questions

Lieutenant General Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., Eighth Air Force Commander, felt that crew members very likely had many questions they would like to pose during his discussions with them. It was the Commander's belief that for various reasons, very few of these questions would be brought to the surface. He further requested that the commanders get from the crews questions on any subject they may wish discussed. There was to be no limitation on subject matter. If the question was of sufficient import that a crew member was concerned, the Commander desired the opportunity to reply. ¹⁰ (U)

The questions submitted by the 4050th Air Refueling Wing crew members ranged from the "trends in OER's", incentive flights, Capehart units, alert pay, through the subject of having to pay for area clean up. ¹¹ (U)

The 99th Bomb Wing posed such questions as using aircraft commanders as tower officers, air conditioning of the alert building, transfers to satellite bases, promotions, improvements to the Commissary and Base Exchange, Base housing, Supply and SAC MCS, to touch on the major topics. ¹² (U)

Navigator Shortage

Both of the 4050th Air Refueling Wing's tactical squadrons, the 99th and the 384th Air Refueling Squadrons, suffered from a lack of navigators which limited the total number of crews to 29 per squadron. ¹³ (U)

10. Msg, 8AF to Uniform, CS 1178, "Crew Members Questions", 10 September 1959, Exhibit 2.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.

13. Ltr, 8AF to 57AD, et al, DCRM, "Replies to Wing and Squadron Commanders' Remarks in the Air Training Report for the Month of August 1959", 6 October 1959, File, 57D0.

Eighth Air Force remarked that the navigator shortage had been brought to the attention of Headquarters SAC. SAC indicated that there was very little immediate assistance available, therefore, the two navigators in support positions were to be returned to crew duties. The situation would remain critical until April 1960 when¹⁴ the situation was expected to ease. (U)

Another career field presented a problem by its lack of experienced and qualified 431XLB personnel on the flight line which jeopardized the EWO capability of the KC-97 aircraft. This situation would continue until newly assigned personnel were trained and qualified.¹⁵ (U)

The 4050th Wing was notified that a SAC training project had been established to increase unit resources in this AFSC. This training project required units to return airmen possessing primary AFSC 431XLB, who were cross-training to the "E" suffix, for duty in their primary AFSC, and airmen possessing 431XLA cross-training into the "E" suffix to cross-train into the "B" suffix. This training project was established to increase body and skill¹⁶ manning for the tanker force. (U)

Airmen MIRS

The Combat Support Group had a total of 367 airmen not in their required specialties. This non-effective manning was caused by a shortage of 187 airmen and airmen possessing unauthorized

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

AFSCs of skill levels. Upgrade and cross-training action was being taken to reduce the 180 non-effectives. Action by higher headquarters was deemed necessary to assign personnel with proper AFSC and skill levels, to fill the 187 UMD vacancies. ¹⁷ (U)

Personnel Strength

Westover Air Force Base had a total of 10,472 officers, airmen and civilians average assigned personnel in September. The Base, not including the tenant unit strength was 9,165 and the 57th Air Division total less the tenant and the Eighth Air Force units total ¹⁸ was 6,953 officers, airmen and civilians. (U)

Headquarters 57th Air Division had an average assigned strength of 18 officers, 24 airmen and 3 civilians. The units that were added to the 57th Air Division total were the 814th Medical Group and 590th Air Force Band. The total, then, for the 57th Air Division and the ¹⁹ above mentioned units was 102 officers, 274 airmen and 52 civilians. (U)

Other totals were 390 officers, 1987 airmen and 13 civilians for the 99th Bombardment Wing; 257 officers, 1027 airmen and 11 civilians for the 4050th Air Refueling Wing and the 814th Combat Support Group had 150 officers, 2327 airmen and 363 civilians. The Eighth Air Force units total was 418 officers, 1591 airmen and 203 civilians. Westover's tenant units counted 237 officers, 1025 airmen and 45 ²⁰ civilians. (U)

17. Ltr, 814CSG to 8AF, BCR, "Monthly Analysis (Sept 59), RCS: SAC-T3598AF-1", 20 October 1959, Exhibit 4.

18. "Monthly Strength Report", 814CSG, prep by D/Compt 814CSG, 30 September 1959, Exhibit 8.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

Assumption of Command

Brigadier General John C. Meyer, assumed Command of the 57th Air Division on 9 September 1959 vice Colonel O. F. Lassiter, who had been serving as Commander pending the arrival of General
21
Meyer. (U)

The General has the distinction of being hailed as the top fighter ace in Eighth Air Force during World War II. On Christmas Day, 1944, as a Lieutenant Colonel, he became the leading American ace in Europe when he brought his total kills to thirty-two. He has over 19 years active military service having been accepted in
22
the aviation cadet program in November of 1939. (U)

Prior to his transfer to the 57th Air Division, he was a member of the Evaluation Staff of the Air War College of the Air
23
University at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. (U)

-
21. Biography, General Meyer, Exhibit 10.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.

CHAPTER II

OPERATIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Award Programs

Headquarters Eighth Air Force established an Air Refueling Awards Program that was to begin 1 September 1959. There were to be two Golden Boom Awards; one for the KC-97 and one for the KC-135 units. The presentations were to be based on the highest monthly air refueling efficiency in each class with certificates going to the winners of the Golden Boom each month. This new program would eliminate the Silver Boom award that had been in effect as the award going to the unit showing the most improvement. In addition, a plaque was to be awarded the squadron attaining the highest air refueling efficiency for the four month period. There would be two¹ plaques awarded; one for each type of unit. (U)

Another trophy was to be awarded; one award for the training period. Both type of squadrons would be competing for this trophy. The scoring criteria would be the overall performance in several areas which would measure the overall operational effectiveness of the winning squadron.² (U)

For the May through August training period, the 99th Air Refueling Squadron was runner-up for the Lieutenant Colonel George M. Broutsas Memorial Trophy with an efficiency score of 95.9 per cent.³ (U)

1. Msg, 8AF to XRay, et al, DO 65470, "Air Refueling Award Program", 24 September 1959, File: 57DO.
2. Ibid.
3. Msg, 8AF to Quebec, et al, DO 65575, "Air Refueling Award Winners, May through August Training Period", 21 September 1959, File: 57DO.

The 99th Air Refueling Squadron thus was designated a Major League unit and was authorized to place the gold band around the ice shield of the boom that so designated them as such a unit. The 384th scored 92.4 per cent which also placed them in the major league status and entitled them to the gold band.⁴ (U)

General Sweeney extended his congratulations and appreciation to the Commanders, air crews, maintenance personnel and staffs, for their outstanding performance.⁵ (U)

It was later established that those units that had achieved Major League status would be authorized incentive flights that were termed, "All Star" flights. General Meyer forwarded this information to the 4050th Air Refueling Wing with pleasure and encouraged deserving aircrews and maintenance personnel to conduct these All Star flights as operational commitments permitted.⁶ (U)

The Air Refueling Wing again drew kudos from the Eighth Air Force and Division Commanders on their outstanding record in support of the "Steel Trap" operation. The Division Commander stated that the outstanding performance exhibited by the Wing could only be attributed to the professional ability of the highest degree and concentrated effort on the part of every member of the 4050th.⁷ (U)

The 99th Bomb Wing not to be outdone by its tactical counterpart was the top Wing in the July "Heads Up" standings. The 99th

4. Msg, 8AF to Quebec, et al, C 65962, "Designation of Major League Units", 21 September 1959, Exhibit 11.

5. Ibid.

6. Ltr, 57AD to 4050ARW, C, "Major League "All Star" Flights", 16 September 1959, Exhibit 12.

7. Ltr, 57AD to 4050ARW, DO, "Outstanding Performance, Reflex Action", 28 September 1959, Exhibit 13.

scored 2752 points to head off its nearest competitor by 287⁸ points. (U)

"Heads Up" operations by the Bomb Wing in August brought the 99th closer to the Brigadier General Saunders Trophy when they scored 3444 points to remain in first place for that month. In the final standings and total points accumulated the 99th Bomb Wing achieved their goal and captured the trophy with a total of 3262⁹ points. (U)

Eighth Air Force later suspended operations on the "Heads Up" concept during the October-December 1959 period. A monthly plaque to the unit achieving the best results in daily activity under the "Heads Up" concept would be continued by higher headquarters.¹⁰ The operation was to resume in January 1960 and higher headquarters air operations schedule was to be amended to reflect the cancellation.¹¹ (U)

Aircraft Allocation

The 99th Bomb Wing was allocated 30 B-52 aircraft in August; 31 aircraft of the same type in September and a projected allocation of 31 aircraft in October. The B-52B aircraft was to undergo a loss from August to September. The number of this model was to have been 18 in August and the inventory was to drop to 15 in September. There was no change scheduled for October when the number would remain at fifteen.¹² (C)

CONFIDENTIAL

8. Msg, 8AF to XRay, et al, DO 65128, "July Heads Up Final Standings", 1 September 1959, File: 57DO
9. Msg, 8AF to XRay, et al, DOT 65614, August and May-August Heads Up Final Standings", 25 September 1959, File: 57DO.
10. Msg, 8AF to 57AD, et al, CS 65405, "Heads Up", 14 September 1959, File: 57DO
11. Msg, 8AF to 57AD, et al, DOOL 65533, "Heads Up", 16 September 1959, File: 57DO
12. Ltr, SAC to 8AF, DOOPA, "SAC Aircraft Allocation Program", 16 September 1959, Exhibit 14.

CONFIDENTIAL

12

The 99th Air Refueling Squadron was allocated 21 KC-135 aircraft and was to maintain this same number from August through October. The 384th Air Refueling Squadron was to maintain 21 KC-97G aircraft in August and September with a projected loss of one aircraft in October.¹³ (C)

Simulator Training

The 57th Air Division was notified that Eighth Air Force proposed to affect an equitable distribution of available B-52 simulator training between the 4138th Strategic Wing, Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, and the 99th Bomb Wing using the Westover simulator. It was the intent of higher headquarters to insure that SAC training regulations received the proper priority. It was felt that in order to accomplish the minimum training in the best interests of flying safety, the simulator had to operate a minimum of three periods per day. To attain this goal, the Division Commander had to insure that the simulator was fully manned in accordance with the appropriate UMD, Eighth Air Force stated.¹⁴ (U)

The Division was also informed that Eighth Air Force would assist in the establishment of a mutually agreeable schedule by personally coordinating with the ground training officer, 99th Bomb Wing and the OIC, B-52 simulator.¹⁵ (U)

13. Ibid.

14. Msg, 8AF to 57AD, et al, DOT 65106, "B-52 Simulator Training", 29 August 1959, File: 57DO.

15. Ibid.

CONFIDENTIAL

The KC-135 simulator was to be under the same plan as the one¹⁶ mentioned above involving the B-52 simulator. (U)

Base Instrument School Instructors

The 99th Air Refueling Squadron requested release from the requirement to provide instructor personnel for the Base Instrument School. The requirement for instructors would provide another problem in meeting both "Steel Trap" flying schedule and the squadron's¹⁷ program to provide an adequate number of days off for each crew. (U)

The 99th had three combat ready crews that could not be used unless substitute aircraft commanders were provided. It was the squadron's thinking that if ground training and other support requirements were to take precedence over the squadron's test commitments, it would be more logical to give priority to their own problems first. In order to expend every effort on their primary mission, such as Headstart II and Steel Trap, they had not been able to schedule crews for such ground training requirements as Handgun Familiarization, Land Survival, Water Survival and other allied requirements. In addition, they had not been able to provide the number¹⁸ of days off directed by higher. (U)

The Division was notified by the Wing Deputy Commander for Operations that a review of the records of pilots assigned to the 384th and 99th Air Refueling Squadrons by Base Personnel revealed

-
- 16. Msg, 8AF to 57AD, et al, DOT 65090, "KC-135 Simulator Training", 27 August 1959, File: 57DO.
 - 17. DF, 4050DCO from 99 ARSC, "Instructors for Base Instrument School", 14 August 1959, File: 57DO.
 - 18. Ibid.

that a total of seven individuals from the 99th and one from the 384th had completed a course of instruction at a USAF Instrument School. The 4050th Wing concurred with the request for request for release and added that in view of the impending transfer of one qualified person from the 384th to the Wing Command Post, the Wing further requested release from the instructor commitment until qualified personnel became available in the 384th, and/or the 99th was relieved of its Steel Trap commitments. ¹⁹ (U)

The Division agreed with the fact that a shortage of USAF Instrument School graduates did exist in the 4050th Air Refueling Wing. While the Division did agree with this fact, it had to be agreed that the requirement for an instrument school was valid and further that the instruction workload within the school should be shared by all organizations. Instructors provided by the 99th Bomb Wing were from the Wing standardization section. Since, according to SAC directives, an instructor could be provided by employing wing or squadron standardization pilots and the 4050th Air Refueling Wing possessed a large number of qualified pilots, the Division Director of Operations requested that the Wing favorably consider supporting this requirement. ²⁰ (U)

The Wing, in turn, requested that since the 99th Air Refueling Squadron was engaged in Steel Trap, and since the organization was

-
- 19. DF, 57DO from 4050DCO, "Instructors for Base Instrument School", 20 August 1959, File: 57DO.
 - 20. DF, 4050DCO from 57DO, "Instructors for Base Instrument School", 4 September 1959, File: 57DO.

not operating under a crew scheduling effectiveness program, it was absolutely necessary that the 99th be notified at least one month in advance when the services of assigned officers would be required for instructor duties. This procedure would allow the unit to consider the requirement when planning their monthly program and insure the availability of the officers concerned. ²¹ (U)

The Division informed the Base Deputy Commander for Operations that since both tactical units were scored by higher headquarters in the area of "time off" afforded to air crews and in deviations made to schedules of air crew duties, they requested that the Base levy instructor schedules for the instrument school to each wing in time to permit these scheduled additional duties to appear in their monthly operations order. ²² (U)

The 99th Bomb Wing had encountered a training problem that involved providing refresher training in Electronic Countermeasures prior to the beginning of the new training quarter. The 99th Deputy Director of Operations requested that the ECM mock-up room with operational ECM mock-up, plus a classroom for 15 operators, be made available for this training. The Wing anticipated a continuing training requirement in procedures and ECM theory that would be brought about with the ever-changing ECM program. ²³ (U)

-
- 21. DF, 57DO from 4050DCO, "Instructors for Base Instrument School", 14 September 1959, File: 57DO
 - 22. DF, BDCO from 57DO, "Instructors for Base Instrument School", 16 September 1959, File: 57DO
 - 23. DF, 57DO from 99DCO, "ECM Mock-Up", 11 August 1959, File: 57DO.

Base Director of Operations was notified by the Division Director of Operations of the Wing's requirements and stated further that it was understood at Division level that this trainer facility was used on a limited basis by the Eighth Air Force Command Section. It appeared, the Division remarked, that the 99th Bomb Wing's requirement was valid and according to the information received from Eighth Air Force Training Conference many changes were forthcoming in the ECM program that were designed to add more realism into the actual ECM activity. It was expected that vulnerability periods for the operators would be changed in concept and increased.²⁴ (U)

The Base Deputy for Operations informed the Division that the classroom space and operational ECM mock-up were available as requested by the Wing. The only problem area that was encountered by the training unit was personnel to operate and maintain this mock-up. While the UMD authorized two NCOs for this purpose, the training unit had available only one Staff Sergeant who was on flying status. With this situation, when this man was flying, sick call or otherwise not available, there would be no one available to man the ECM section.²⁵ (U)

To preclude this situation, Base Operations recommended that a 301X3 be authorized and assigned to the section. It was thought that this would insure the availability of a qualified instructor

24. DF, BECO from 57DO, "ECM Mock-Up", 20 August 1959, File: 57DO.

25. DF, 57DO from BDCO, "ECM Mock-Up", 2 September 1959, File: 57DO.

SECRET

17

at all times and enable the maintenance and inspection of the ECM
26
trainer. (U)

The Base Director of Personnel was notified of the shortage
of assigned personnel to man the ECM trainer and further pointed
out a requirement for an increased manning authorization to cover
27
the area of maintenance and inspection. (U)

WEapons Performance

The 24th Aviation Depot Squadron participated in the Eighth
Air Force directed exercise, "Golden Hour Tango", with outstanding
success. No major difficulties were encountered during the alert
operation when the squadron loaded and down loaded 23 B-52 air-
craft. The aircraft were provided with War Reserve units and com-
28
bat loads of .50 caliber ammunition. (S)

-
26. Ibid.
27. DF, 57DP from 57DO, "ECM Mock-Up", 15 September 1959, File: 57DO
28. Interview with Major Colliton, Squadron Commander, 24ADS, by
TSgt Victor L. Miramontes, Historian, 28 October 1959.

SECRET

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTION AND MODIFICATION OF BASE FACILITIES

Crew Readiness Building

Several Unsatisfactory reports were filed on the Crew Readiness Building which had been accepted in January 1959. These discrepancies were varied and included such items as building cracks, defective oil burner, drainage, ventilation and defective sewage removal.¹ (U)

One of the items was that the 3 inch concrete roof slab over the ramp entries adjacent to the building side had cracked near the light fixtures. Water leaked through the slab into and around the fixtures ruining the fixtures and staining the ceiling. The apparent cause of failure was the weakening of the thin slab by embedding therein the electrical conduit running to the fixture. It was recommended that replacement be made of the slab with 4 inches reinforced slab or a thinner slab with a conduit on the surface.² (U)

The oil burner on the water heater was defective in operation. The burner was apparently unable to create a positive draft. It was thought that a contributing factor could have been the lack of proper boiler room ventilation, but the primary deficiency appeared to be defective operation or defective burner design. The primary deficiency was evident when the flame was being extinguished whenever the heating boiler came on or whenever the door to the mechanical

-
1. Report, "Design and Construction Deficiency", USAFIR from BDCCE, 4 August 1959, File: BDCCE, 814CSG.
 2. Ibid.

ventilation room was opened. To correct this problem, it was recommended that the burner be orsat tested, under varying test conditions, such as opening and closing the door to the ventilation room, to determine the cause of the malfunctions and that proper³ corrective action be taken to eliminate the malfunctions. (U)

The designed storm drainage in the area was inadequate to handle the subjected load. Storm water poured off the edge of the alert apron and down the sidewalks toward the tunnel entrances on the West side of the building. Accumulation of up to 6 inches of water or ice occurred at the lowest point and some water actually got into the tunnel entrances. A definite safety hazard prevailed considering the design requirements of the buildings. It was recommended that extensive improvements to the storm drainage system, such as diversion of water from the apron, additional catch basins⁴ and the extension of the culvert system, be made. (U)

Boiler room ventilation was found to be inadequate to supply combustion air and to cool the boiler room to normal operating temperatures. Both oil burners were starving for air and the burner on the hot water heater was failing as often as five or six times daily apparently from its inability to generate a definite draft in the oxygen-starved atmosphere. The only combustion and/or cooling air available was from a 2-inch by 5-inch grille over the door to the mechanical ventilation room. Whatever air entered the boiler

-
3. Report, "Design and Construction Deficiency", AW 30-11-06, USAFIR from BDCCE, 4 August 1959, File: 814CSG BDCCE.
 4. Report, "Design and Construction Deficiency, AD 30-11-12", USAFIR from BDCCE, 4 August 1959, File: 814CSG BDCCE.

room through this high duct was short circuited into the mechanical room through cracks around the door. The recommendation was made that roof ventilating drop leg ducts and/or vent fans to provide the required boiler room ventilation be installed.⁵ (U)

It was also found that the mechanical ventilation system was inadequate to maintain designed room temperatures in both summer and winter. In the winter, outside rooms were extremely cold despite corrective balancing of the system. Room temperatures became hotter than normal during the first week of May, and became unbearable despite the removal of all diffusers and other temporary measures. It was recommended that air conditioning equipment be installed and air handling equipment be modified as required to insure both adequate heating in the winter and cooling in the summer.⁶ (U)

The final items dealt with sewage gases that escaped from around the cover of the sewage ejector and/or through the boiler room floor drains into the boiler room and then permeated into the ventilation room between the door and casing. The sewage odors were then picked up by the ventilating fan and distributed throughout the building. The floor drains were connected through short lateral runs to the trunk sewers under the boiler room floor. The constructing agency had stated that the drains were trapped, even though working drawings did not indicate that the traps were required. The traps dried

-
5. Report, "Design and Construction Deficiency, AD 30-11-12, 4 August 1959, USAFIR from BDCCE, File: 814CSG BDCCE.
 6. Report, "Design and Construction Deficiency, AD 30-11-12, USAFIR from BDCCE, 7 August 1959, File: 814CSG BDCCE.

out frequently and allowed the escapement of sewage gases through the drains. The odor level in the boiler room was usually extremely objectionable. It was recommended that the ejector be made gas tight, that the existing boiler room floor drains be permanently sealed, and a separate sump with sump pump be installed to handle the boiler room drainage.⁷ (U)

Alert Force Trailers

The Division notified Eighth Air Force that the air conditioning units in two of the six travelite trailers delivered to this station during the last Fiscal Year had broken down due to capacitor or transformer troubles. Since these units were covered by a one year guarantee, It was requested that the supply contractor, the Travelite Trailer Corporation of Fort Worth, Texas, be advised to make the necessary repairs under the guarantee clause of the contract. Headquarters SAC had handled the purchase of these trailers.⁸ (U)

Security Barriers

Headquarters Eighth Air Force had developed a method of defining Category I Alert Aircraft Areas which would meet operational and security requirements. The proposed method consisted of a rope barrier supported by stanchions that would define the alert area. A model of this barrier was to be constructed and tested at Westover Air Force Base prior to its adoption by Eighth Air Force.⁹ (U)

-
7. Report, "Design and Construction Deficiency, AW 30-11-12, USAFIR from BDCCE, 7 August 1959, File: 814CSG BDCCE.
 8. Msg, 57AD to 8AF, BDCEED 11660, "Alert Force Dormitory Trailers", 26 August 1959, File: 814CSG BDCEED.
 9. Ltr, 8AF to 57AD, DERL, "Security Barrier Around Category I Alert Aircraft", 18 August 1959, File: 814CSG BDCEMD.

Capehart Housing

It was apparent that full advantage of the technical provisions was not effectively utilized by the Title II Services. This was demonstrated on several occasions by rendering recommendations contrary to the contract requirements. This problem was brought to the attention of the Contracting officer for correction.¹⁰ (U)

It was also brought that the seeming reluctance on the part of the contractor to immediately recognize construction deficiencies and provide for conclusive corrective action prevailed. In Many instances too little consideration was accorded this problem in comparison to its importance.¹¹ (U)

In line with the above, early observation of the initial installation of concrete sidewalks and closely related work had disclosed the several construction deficiencies in the housing area. Sidewalk areas adjacent to B-15 showed irregularities far in excess of the maximum tolerances allowed by the technical provisions and/or good working practices.¹² (U)

Improper installation of expansion joint filler within concrete slab was evidenced by reflective cracks through the wearing surface of concrete above expansion joint filler and further evidenced by transverse cracks throughout the concrete pavement. Transverse irregularities were found in dummy groove jointing furthered by insufficient depth to dummy groove joints and lacking

10. "Family Housing Development and Construction Progress Report, RCS: 1AF Z-11", Assistant CofS, Installation Headquarters, USAF from WAFB, 31 August 1959, File: 814CSG BDCCE.

11. Ibid.

12. DF, BDCMP from BDCCE, 814CSG, "Construction Deficiencies Capehart", 5 August 1959, File: 814CSG BDCCE.

in transverse continuity throughout the slab. Spalling of concrete honeycombing in the sidewalk edges indicated insufficient compaction of concrete.¹³ (U)

The sidewalk forms at the garage entrance approaches were not of sufficient depth as required for this portion of pavement that resulted in deformed concrete in the lower two inches of pavement. It was brought out again that the Title II inspection forces had been repeatedly informed of the previous discrepancies with requests that immediate corrective action be taken. Explanation on the basis that little consideration was placed upon these requests substantiated the conclusion that indecision was existing on the part of the Title II inspection services to provide for immediate decisive correction action.¹⁴ (U)

It was requested by the Division that off-site funds in the amount of \$800.00 be provided for additional pole line construction necessary to provide adequate commercial telephone service for the Capehart Housing Project. The Architect-Engineer's pole line design failed to coordinate commercial telephone requirements in the construction plans and it appeared that the Base would soon have some Capehart units ready for occupancy but lacking facilities for telephone service. To forestall this impending lack of telephone service in the nearly completed Capehart units, it was recommended that expeditious approval action for the requested amount be taken.¹⁵ (U)

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.

15. Msg, 57AD to 8AF, BDCEED 12203, "Capehart Title VIII 310 Unit Housing Project", 9 September 1959, File: 814CSG BDCEED

ROSTER OF KEY PERSONNEL

57th Air Division

Brigadier General

MEYER, John C.

Commander

Colonel

BLANTON, Ernest L.

Director of Operations

HUFFMAN, Orland G.

Director of Materiel

PETERSON, David A.

Director of Personnel

Major

HINDSLEY, John A.

Director of Comptroller

814th Combat Support Group

Colonel

LEWIS, William C.

Commander

Lieutenant Colonel

AMYX, William M.

Director of Comptroller

CONKLIN, Joseph E.

D/Commander for Engineering

DAVIS, Donald S.

Chief, Information Office

MURPHY, Jack A.

Vice Commander

PEAKE, William K.

D/Commander for Materiel

Major

HOPPIN, John E.

Director of Administrative Services

HORTON, Andrew S.

Staff Judge Advocate

KELLEY, Edward F., III

Staff Provost Marshal

LEWIS, Francis E.

Base Safety Officer

SHACKELFORD, Henry S.

Base Supply Officer

VAN DOLSON, John F., Jr.

D/Commander for Services

WARK, Charles D.

D/Commander for Operations

Captain

CASSIDY, Catherine M.

Dependents Assistance Officer

814th Combat Support Group Squadron Commanders

Lieutenant Colonel

GUNTER, George C., Jr.

Unit Command Section

Major

BELLINOGG, Abraham
COLLITON, Edward F.
PARSONS, Frank P.
ROSA, Domenic
SEMMELE, Woodrow A.
SWANSON, Selim H.

Food Service Squadron
24th Aviation Depot Squadron
Operations Squadron
Supply Squadron
Transportation Squadron
Aircraft Support Squadron

Captain

RYAN, Paul L.
WISE, William H.

Installation Squadron
Combat Defense Squadron

Lieutenant

WISE, Donna L.

WAF Squadron Section

Other 57th Air Division Key Personnel

Colonel

BURRELL, Harry R.
HOFFMAN, I. Louis
LASSITER, O. F.

Commander, 4050th Air Refueling Wing
Commander, 814th Medical Group
Commander, 99th Bombardment Wing

Lieutenant Colonel

BONINB, John

Commandant, 8AFNCO Academy

Major

LAForge, Jack A.

OIC, B-52 Simulator

Captain

THOMPSON, Norman C.

OIC, KC-135 Simulator

Warrant Officer

LANZILLOTTI, Joseph F.

Commander, 590th Air Force Band

HEADQUARTERS
57TH AIR DIVISION (SAC)
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
Westover Air Force Base, Mass

M
21/2

GENERAL ORDERS)
NUMBER 3)

9 September 1959

ASSUMPTION OF COMMAND: Under the provisions of Air Force Regulation 35-54, the undersigned hereby assumes Command of the 57th Air Division (SAC), this station, effective this date.

John C Meyer
JOHN C MEYER
BRIGGEN, USAF
Commander

DISTRIBUTION: A

BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN C. MEYER

Brigadier General John C. Meyer, top fighter ace in Eighth Air Force during World War II, as been in active military service for over 19 years with a background of extensive duty in the United States and abroad.

Born in Brooklyn, New York, April 3, 1919, he had completed two years at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire, when he enlisted in the aviation cadet program in November of 1939.

He received his commission and pilot wings in July, 1940, and by 1941 he completed fighter pilot instruction basic school at Randolph Field, Texas and Gunter Field, Alabama.

He served in the United States and Iceland until January, 1943, when he was directed to organize and activate the 487th Fighter Squadron at Westover Field, Massachusetts. The following July he took his squadron to Europe as part of the 352d Fighter Group of the Eighth Air Force. In November, 1944, he became Deputy Commander of the 352d Fighter Group.

General Meyer became the leading American ace in Europe on Christmas Day, 1944, when he brought his total air and ground kills to thirty-two.

In 1945, he was assigned to the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force as House Liaison Officer.

He was named the Commander of the 4th Fighter Group in Newcastle, Delaware, in 1947 but the outbreak of the Korean Conflict caused his return to combat and an upgrade to Deputy Commander of the 4th Fighter Wing in Korea.

In 1951, he was reassigned to Larson Air Force Base, Washington, as Deputy Commander of the 101st Fighter Interceptor Wing and in 1952, he was named Director of Operations and Training at Headquarters Continental Air

(MORE)

Defense Command at Ent Air Force Base, Colorado.

After graduating from the Air War College of Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, he was made a member of the Evaluation Staff of the College.

He remained in this position until his reassignment to Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts as Commander of the 57th Air Division in September of 1959.

General Meyer is married to ex-Navy-Lieutenant Mary Moore of Fort Lee, New Jersey and the couple has five children: Peter, 11; Christine, 9; John, Jr., 7; Mike, 4; and Maggie, 2.

PROMOTIONS

Second Lieutenant, 27 July, 1940; first lieutenant, 1 November, 1941; captain, 21 January, 1943; major, 2 September, 1943; lieutenant colonel, 18 April, 1944; colonel, 19 January, 1951; brigadier general, 26 July, 1959.



